Please type a plus sign

PTO/SB/21 (08-00) Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paper Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.									
TRANSMITTAL					Application Number		10/791,695		
FORM					Filing Date		March 2, 2004		
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)					First Named Inventor		David R. Zittel		
					Group Art Unit		1761		
					Examiner Name		Tiomthy Simone		
	Total Numb	er of Pages in This Sub	mission 9		Attorney Docket Numb	ber	338.072		
			ENCLOSUI	RES	(check all that apply))			
	Fee Transmittal Form			ignr an i	ment Papers Application)		After Allowance Communication to Group		
	Fee Attached Forma			mal	Drawings		Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences		
	Amendment /	'Reply	Lice	ensir	ng-related Papers		Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)		
	After F	inal	Pet	ition			Proprietary Information		
				to Convert to a nal Application		Status Letter			
	Extension of Time Request Chan				of Correspondence		Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):		
	Express Abar	ndonment Request			ry Disclaimer				
\boxtimes	Information D	isclosure Statement			st for Refund				
				mber of CD(s)					
	Response to Notification of Missing Requirements Under 35 USC 371 Remarks								
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53				_					
DECLARATION SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT									
Firm David D. Stein, Registration No. 40,828									
or Individual name Boyle, Fredrickson, Newholm, Stein & Gratz, S.C.							S.C.		
Çuştomer No.: 23598									
Signature D. St.									
Date JANUARY 27, 2005									
CERTIFICATE OF MAILING									
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on this date: January 29, 2005									
Type or printed name Dawn M. Oleszak									
Signature January 27, 2005									

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any formments on the amount of time your are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450. Alexandria. VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Date: Knuary 27 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ventor(s): David R. Zittel et al Docket No.: 338.072

Serial No.: 10/791,695 Filed: March 2, 2004

Reissue of.: U.S. Pat. 6,234,066 Issued: May 22, 2001

Examiner: **Timothy Simone** Group Art Unit: 1761

Title: Rotary Blancher for Processing Food Product

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In this Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement, patentee wishes to make record the blueprint of Hughes Company dated June 16, 1997 submitted herewith that was enclosed with a letter dated February 12, 2003 from Hughes' patent attorney, a copy of which is also enclosed. As is noted in the attached letter, Hughes' contends the blancher shown in its 1997 blueprint is prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) due to its commercial installation and use at Listowel, Canada in 1997. The Angy blancher discussed in the letter refers to a current Hughes blancher design that Hughes contends is based on the 1997 blancher. Other than that, the Hughes/Angy blancher is not believed to be prior art and has not been included.

S.N. 10/791,695 Art Unit: 1761

Page 2 of the enclosed Hughes' February 12, 2003 letter states that the 1997 Hughes' blancher has a single water recirculation pipe with discharge nozzles mounted beneath the blancher's rotating perforate drum. The letter further states that the 1997 Hughes' blancher has two steam pipes to provide heated steam to the water in the blancher over the length of the blancher.

From the Hughes 1997 blancher blueprint, it appears that the water recirculation pipe, labeled "Water Recirculation Manifold" in the Hughes 1997 blancher blueprint, has a length that is less than about one-third the total length of the blancher. One steam pipe, labeled "Steam Manifold" in the Hughes 1997 blancher blueprint, appears to have a length that extends from one end of the blancher to about the halfway point of the blancher and the other steam pipe appears to have a length that extends from the opposite end of the blancher to about the halfway point of the blancher.

No other parameters, including operating parameters, have been provided by Hughes. However, Hughes stated in its letter that the current Hughes/Angy blancher design is very similar to the Hughes 1997 blancher. Assuming that to be the case, it appears that the single water recirculation pipe of the Hughes 1997 blancher is somewhere around 55 inches long and made of 2 inch tubing or piping having ½ inch to ¾ inch discharge nozzle openings spaced about 2 inches apart from each other. If it uses the same or similar 5 horsepower pump as in the Hughes/Angy blancher design, it is roughly estimated that the water flow rate out each discharge nozzle would be somewhere around 2-4 gpm at a pressure of somewhere around 5-15 psi. It may be possible to increase output pressure somewhat by further constricting flow out each discharge nozzle, but this would reduce the water flow rate to something less than the aforementioned 2-4 gpm estimate.

The steam flow rate(s) and steam pressure(s) are not known for the 1997 Hughes blancher or the Hughes/Angy blancher.

Page 3 of the enclosed Hughes February 12, 2003 letter asserts that De Back, U.S. Patent No. 2,299,088 (actually U.S. Patent No. 2,299,080) is prior art to the claimed invention. It should be noted that De Back's more comprehensive parent, U.S. Patent No.

S.N. 10/791,695 Art Unit: 1761

2,314,871, was considered by the Examiner during the prosecution of patentee's U.S. Patent No. 6,234,066, which is the subject of the above-identified reissue application. It also should be noted that patentee's U.S. Patent No. 6,214,400 is also currently under reissue and has been assign U.S. appln. no. 10/791,694. Copies of both De Back patents are also being submitted herewith in this information disclosure statement.

In addition, the patentee wishes to supplement and clarify the record regarding a prior art commercial blancher installation of the patentee, the general parameters of which are summarized and disclosed at col. 1, line 66 through col. 21, line 2 of the Background of the Invention section of patentee's '066 patent. Patentee's blancher is believed to have had only one water recirculation manifold and no steam manifold.

Further analysis of the operating parameters of this prior art commercial blancher installation of the patentee indicates that a 7½ horsepower pump was used to pump water through a water recirculation header having a length of about 53 inches. The water recirculation header was equipped with twenty-one discharge nozzles that each had an opening 1/8 inch in diameter and that were spaced apart from each other between about 2 and 3 inches. The water pressure in the water recirculation header was estimated to be somewhere between 42-48 psi, which is higher than the 8 psi stated in the aforementioned Background of the Invention section of patentee's '066 patent. However, the water flow rate out each discharge nozzle of the water recirculation header is estimated to have been somewhere around 1-2 gpm, which is lower than the 10 gpm stated in the Background of the Invention section of patentee's '066 patent.

DAVID R. ZITTEL ET AL

S.N. 10/791,695 Art Unit: 1761

While neither the 1997 Hughes blancher, the De Back patents, nor the patentee's own prior art blancher are believed to be material to the patentability to the invention claimed in the '066 patent or to any of the presently pending claims in the above-identified application, the Examiner is nonetheless requested to take all of this into careful consideration in examining the above-identified application. If the Examiner needs additional information that might be helpful in making this determination, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

David D. Stein

Reg. No. 40,828

Boyle, Fredrickson, Newholm, Stein & Gratz, S.C. 250 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1030 Milwaukee, WI 53202

Phone: (414) 225-9755 Fax: (414) 225-9753

Customer No.: 23598



Form PTO-1449

U.S. Department of Commerce Patent and Trademark Office

Appln. No. 10/791,695 Atty. Docket No. 338.072

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT

(Use several sheets if necessary)

Applicant David R. Zittel et al		
Filing Date	Group Art Unit	
March 2, 2004	1761	

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS							
EXAMINER INITIAL	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE	
	2,299,080	10/20/42	De Back	426	509		
	2,314,871	3/30/43	De Back	134	65		
					 		
			1				

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS							
DOCUMENT					TRANSLATION		
NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	YES	NO	
1							
		DOCUMENT	DOCUMENT	DOCUMENT	DOCUMENT	DOCUMENT TRANSI	

OTHER REFERENCES (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)						
		Blueprint of Hughes blancher dated June 16, 1997 of its 1997 blancher installation at Campbell Soup's factory in Listowel, Canada				

*EXAMINER	DATE CONSIDERED
*Evaminer: Initial if reference considered, whether or not cital	tion is in conformance with MDED 600: Draw line through

citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication with client.